



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

	States Fateut and Frademark Office
Address:	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/855,499	05/16/2001	Patrick Blanc	Q64525	9426	
23373	7590 06/06/2005		EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			GANTT, ALAN T		
2100 PENNSY SUITE 800	YLVANIA AVENUE, N.W	7.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	ON, DC 20037		2684		
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/06/2000	ς .	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/855,499	BLANC, PATRICK
Examiner	Art Unit .
Alan T. Gantt	

Advisory Action	09/800,499	BLANC, PATRICK					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit .					
	Alan T. Gantt	2684					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
 THE REPLY FILED <u>15 April</u> 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF		•					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened states above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months pearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any estimates Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f will not be entered	necause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
appeal, and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
P. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet			nce because:				
12.   Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   13.   Other:    NICK CORSARO   NICK CORSARO   Alan T. Gantt							
	NICK CORSARO NICK CORSARINER	Alan T. Gantt					
DRIMARY EXTENSION							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In revewing applicant's arguments and the Salonaho reference, the passage quoted by both the applicant and the examiner allows for a power control processing unit to adjust the power correction interval adaptively where the new value is communicated in the initiation message together with the new target power, thus meeting the first limitation. Also, there are provisions for the use of a timer in determining the commencement of the interval, and the use of timers are common when providing for perodic changes. Thus, the examiner feels that with the very limited language of applicant's independent claims and the passages of the Salonaho reference, there is not enough to distinguish applicant's invention of the independent claims from the Salonaho reference.